

Noncommuting fields and non-Abelian fluids

R. Jackiw^{a*}

^aCenter for Theoretical Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139-4307

The original ideas about noncommuting coordinates are recalled. The connection between U(1) gauge fields defined on noncommuting coordinates and fluid mechanics is explained. Non-Abelian fluid mechanics is described.

I The idea that configuration-space coordinates may not commute,

$$[x^i, x^j] = i\theta^{ij} \quad (1)$$

where θ^{ij} is a constant, antisymmetric two-index object, has arisen recently from string theory, but in fact it has an older history. Like many interesting quantum-mechanical ideas, it was first suggested by Heisenberg, in the late 1930s, who reasoned that coordinate noncommutativity would entail a coordinate uncertainty and could ameliorate short-distance singularities, which beset quantum fields. He told his idea to Peierls, who eventually made use of it when analyzing electronic systems in an external magnetic field, so strong that projection to the lowest Landau level is justified. But this phenomenological realization of Heisenberg's idea, which I shall discuss presently, did not address issues in fundamental science, so Peierls told Pauli about it, who in turn told Oppenheimer, who asked his student Snyder to work it out and this led to the first published paper on the subject [1].

The coordinate noncommutativity in the lowest Landau level is very similar to today's string-theory origins of noncommutativity – both rely on the presence of a strong background field. Also, thus far, it is the only physically realized example of noncommuting coordinates, so let me describe it in a little detail [2]. We consider the motion

of a charged (e) and massive (m) particle in a constant magnetic field (B) pointing along the z direction. All interesting physics is in the x - y plane. The Lagrangian for this planar motion is

$$L = \frac{1}{2}m(\dot{x}^2 + \dot{y}^2) + e(\dot{x}A_x + \dot{y}A_y) - V(x, y) \quad (2)$$

where the vector potential $\mathbf{A}$ can be chosen as $(0, xB)$ and $V(x, y)$ describes additional interactions (“impurities”). In the absence of V , the quantum spectrum consists of the well-known Landau levels $|n, d\rangle$, where n indexes the level's energy eigenvalue, and d describes the infinite degeneracy of each level. The separation between levels is $O(B/m)$, so that in the strong magnetic field limit only the lowest Landau level $|0, d\rangle$ is relevant. But observe that the large B limit corresponds to small m , so projection on the lowest Landau level is also achieved by setting m to zero in (2). In that limit the Lagrangian (2), in the chosen gauge, becomes

$$L_{\ell L} = eBx\dot{y} - V(x, y) . \quad (3)$$

This is of the form $p\dot{q} - H(p, q)$, and immediately identifies eBx and y as canonical conjugates, leading in the usual way to the commutator

$$[x, y] = -i\frac{\hbar}{eB} . \quad (4)$$

(The “Peierls substitution” consists of determining the effect of the impurity by computing the eigenvalues of $V(x, y)$, where x and y are noncommuting. There is much more to be said about

*This work is supported in part by funds provided by the US Department of Energy (DOE) under cooperative research agreement #DF-FC02-94ER40818

this. For example, the issue of ordering the (now) noncommuting arguments (x, y) of V must be settled. Also one needs to understand the behavior of wave functions. Before the (phase-space reductive) strong- B limit they depend on *both* x and y , while after the limit they can depend only on *one* of the two noncommuting variables, all the time retaining their normalization. All this, as well as other matters, is explained in Ref. [2].)

For another perspective, consider calculating the lowest Landau level matrix elements of the $[x, y]$ commutator

$$\langle 0, d | xy - yx | 0, d' \rangle = M(d, d') - M^*(d', d) \quad (5)$$

where

$$M(d, d') = \langle 0, d | xy | 0, d' \rangle. \quad (6)$$

We evaluate (6) by inserting intermediate states in product xy :

$$M(d, d') = \sum_s \langle 0, d | x | s \rangle \langle s | y | 0, d' \rangle. \quad (7)$$

If the sum is over *all* the degenerate Landau levels, then one finds that (5) vanishes: x and y do commute! But if one pretends that the world is restricted to the lowest Landau level and includes only that level (with its degeneracy) in the intermediate state sum

$$M_{\ell L \ell} = \sum_{d''} \langle 0, d | x | 0, d'' \rangle \langle 0, d'' | y | 0, d' \rangle \quad (8)$$

one finds that on this truncated state space, eq. (5) becomes consistent with (4):

$$\langle 0, d | [x, y] | 0, d' \rangle = -i \frac{\hbar}{eB} \langle 0, d | 0, d' \rangle. \quad (9)$$

A generalization now suggests itself: Suppose one retains not just the lowest Landau level, but includes the first N levels (setting $N = 0$ for the lowest level) [3]. In this case one should consider all levels $n \leq N$, both as external states and contributing to the intermediate state sum in (7). The result is that the matrix elements of the coordinate commutator vanish unless the external levels (n, n') coincide, $n = n'$, and for the coincident case the only nonvanishing matrix element

is at the highest Landau level $n = n' = N$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle N, d | [x, y] | N, d' \rangle & \\ &= -i \frac{\hbar}{eB} (N + 1) \langle N, d | N, d' \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

As $N \rightarrow \infty$, more and more levels are included, the highest level decouples and the coordinates commute.

II Let me now return to the general and abstract problem of noncommuting coordinates. When confronting the noncommutativity postulate (1), it is natural to ask which (infinitesimal) coordinate transformations

$$\delta x^i = -f^i(x) \quad (11)$$

leave (1) unchanged. The answer is that the (infinitesimal) transformation vector function $f^i(x)$ must be determined by a scalar $f(x)$ through the expression [4]

$$f^i(x) = \theta^{ij} \partial_j f(x). \quad (12)$$

Since then $\partial_i f^i(x) = 0$, these are recognized as volume-preserving transformations. [They do not exhaust all volume-preserving transformations, except in two dimensions. In dimensions greater two, (12) defines a subgroup of volume-preserving transforms that also leave θ^{ij} invariant.]

The volume-preserving transformations form the link between noncommuting coordinates and fluid mechanics. Since the theory of fluid mechanics is not widely known outside the circle of fluid mechanicians, let me put down some relevant facts [5]. There are two, physically equivalent descriptions of fluid motion: One is the Lagrange formulation, wherein the fluid elements are labeled, first by a discrete index n : $\mathbf{X}_n(t)$ is the position as a function of time of the n th fluid element. Then one passes to a continuous labeling variable $n \rightarrow \mathbf{x}$: $\mathbf{X}_n(t) \rightarrow \mathbf{X}(t, \mathbf{x})$, and $\mathbf{x}$ may be taken to be the position of the fluid element at initial time $\mathbf{X}(0, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$. This is a comoving description. Because labels can be arbitrarily rearranged, without affecting physical content, the continuum description is invariant against volume-preserving transformations of

$\mathbf{x}$, and in particular, it is invariant against the specific volume-preserving transformations (12), provided the fluid coordinate $\mathbf{X}$ transforms as a scalar:

$$\delta_f \mathbf{X} = f^i(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \mathbf{X} = \theta^{ij} \partial_i \mathbf{X} \partial_j f. \quad (13)$$

The common invariance of Lagrange fluids and of noncommuting coordinates is a strong hint of a connection between the two.

Formula (13) takes a very suggestive form when we rewrite it in terms of a bracket defined for functions of $\mathbf{x}$ by

$$\{\mathcal{O}_1(\mathbf{x}), \mathcal{O}_2(\mathbf{x})\} = \theta^{ij} \partial_i \mathcal{O}_1(\mathbf{x}) \partial_j \mathcal{O}_2(\mathbf{x}). \quad (14)$$

Note that with this bracket we have

$$\{x^i, x^j\} = \theta^{ij}. \quad (15)$$

So we can think of bracket relations as classical precursors of commutators for a noncommutative field theory – the latter obtained from the former by replacing brackets by $-i$ times commutators, à la Dirac. More specifically, we shall see that the noncommuting field theory that emerges from the Lagrange fluid is a noncommuting $U(1)$ gauge theory.

This happens when the following steps are taken. We define the evolving portion of $\mathbf{X}$ by

$$X^i(t, \mathbf{x}) = x^i + \theta^{ij} \hat{A}_j(t, \mathbf{x}). \quad (16)$$

(It is assumed that θ^{ij} has an inverse.) Then (13) is equivalent to the suggestive expression

$$\delta_f \hat{A}_i = \partial_i f + \{\hat{A}_i, f\}. \quad (17)$$

When the bracket is replaced by $(-i)$ times the commutator, this is precisely the gauge transformation for a noncommuting $U(1)$ gauge potential $\hat{A}_i$. Moreover, the gauge field $\hat{F}_{ij}$ emerges from the bracket of two Lagrange coordinates

$$\{X^i, X^j\} = \theta^{ij} + \theta^{im} \theta^{jn} \hat{F}_{mn} \quad (18)$$

$$\hat{F}_{mn} = \partial_m \hat{A}_n - \partial_n \hat{A}_m + \{\hat{A}_m, \hat{A}_n\}. \quad (19)$$

Again (19) is recognized from the analogous formula in noncommuting gauge theory.

III What can one learn from the parallel formalism for a Lagrange fluid and a noncommuting gauge field? One result that has been obtained addresses the question of what is a gauge field's covariant response to a coordinate transformation. This question can be put already for commuting, non-Abelian gauge fields, where conventionally the response is given in terms of a Lie derivative L_f :

$$\delta_f x^\mu = -f^\mu(x) \quad (20)$$

$$\delta_f A_\mu = L_f A_\mu \equiv f^\alpha \partial_\alpha A_\mu + \partial_\mu f^\alpha A_\alpha. \quad (21)$$

But this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_f F_{\mu\nu} &= L_f F_{\mu\nu} \\ &\equiv f^\alpha \partial_\alpha F_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu f^\alpha F_{\alpha\nu} + \partial_\nu f^\alpha F_{\mu\alpha} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

which is not covariant since the derivative in the first term on the right is not the covariant one. Thus we consider the conventional approach to be defective because it does not preserve gauge invariance. The cure in this, commuting, situation has been given some time ago [6]: Observe that (21) may be equivalently presented as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_f A_\mu &= L_f A_\mu = f^\alpha (\partial_\alpha A_\mu - \partial_\mu A_\alpha - i[A_\alpha, A_\mu]) \\ &\quad + f^\alpha \partial_\mu A_\alpha - i[A_\mu, f^\alpha A_\alpha] + \partial_\mu f^\alpha A_\alpha \\ &= f^\alpha F_{\alpha\mu} + D_\mu(f^\alpha A_\alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Thus, if the coordinate transformation generated by f^α is supplemented by a gauge transformation generated by $-f^\alpha A_\alpha$, the result is a gauge covariant coordinate transformation

$$\delta'_f A_\mu = f^\alpha F_{\alpha\mu} \quad (24)$$

and the modified response of $F_{\mu\nu}$ involves the gauge-covariant Lie derivative L'_f :

$$\begin{aligned} \delta'_f F_{\mu\nu} &= L'_f F_{\mu\nu} \\ &\equiv f^\alpha D_\alpha F_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu f^\alpha F_{\alpha\nu} + \partial_\nu f^\alpha F_{\mu\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

In the noncommuting situation, loss of covariance in the ordinary Lie derivative is even greater, because in general the coordinate transformation functions f^α do not commute with the fields $\hat{A}_\mu, \hat{F}_{\mu\nu}$; moreover, multiplication of x -dependent

quantities is not a covariant operation. All these issues can be addressed and resolved by considering them in the fluid mechanical context, at least, for linear and volume-preserving diffeomorphisms. The analysis is technical and I refer you to the published papers [4,7]. The final result for the covariant coordinate transformation on the noncommuting gauge potential $\hat{A}_\mu$, generated by $f^\alpha(x)$, is

$$\delta'_f \hat{A}_\mu = \frac{1}{2} \{ f^\alpha(X), \hat{F}_{\alpha\mu} \}_+ \quad (26)$$

plus reordering terms.

Note that the generating function $f^\alpha(X)$ enters the anticommutator $\{ , \}_+$ with covariant argument X . f^α is restricted to be either linear or volume-preserving; in the latter case there are reordering terms, whose form is explicitly determined by the fluid mechanical antecedent [4,7].

IV Next, I shall discuss the Seiberg-Witten map [8], which can be made very transparent by the fluid analogy. The Seiberg-Witten map replaces the noncommuting vector potential $\hat{A}_\mu$ by a nonlocal function of a commuting potential A_μ and of θ ; i.e., the former is viewed as a function of the latter. The relationship between the two follows from the requirement of stability against gauge transformations: a noncommuting gauge transformation of the noncommuting gauge potential should be equivalent to a commuting gauge transformation on the commuting vector potential on which the noncommuting potential depends. Formally:

$$\hat{A}_\mu(A + d\lambda) = \hat{A}_\mu^{G(A,\lambda)}(A) . \quad (27)$$

Here λ is the Abelian gauge transformation function that transforms the Abelian, commuting gauge potential A_μ ; $G(A, \lambda)$ is the noncommuting gauge function that transforms the noncommuting gauge potential $\hat{A}_\mu$. G depends on A_μ and λ , and one can show that it is a noncommuting 1-cocycle [9].

Moreover, when the action and the equations of motion of the noncommuting theory are transformed into commuting variables, the dynamical content is preserved: the physics described by

noncommuting variables is equivalently described by the commuting variables, albeit in a complicated, nonlocal fashion.

The Seiberg-Witten map is intrinsically interesting in the unexpected equivalence that it establishes. Moreover, it is practically useful for the following reason. It is difficult to extract gauge-invariant content from a noncommuting gauge theory because quantities constructed locally from $\hat{F}_{\mu\nu}$ are not gauge invariant. To achieve gauge invariance, one must integrate over space-time. Yet for physical analysis one wants local quantities: profiles of propagating waves, etc. Such local quantities can be extracted in a gauge-invariant manner from the physically equivalent, Seiberg-Witten-mapped commutative gauge theory.

For example, colleagues and I addressed the following question [10]. Consider free, commuting Maxwell theory, and its noncommuting counterpart. The physical phenomena implied by the former are well known: they are the electromagnetic waves, e.g., the plane waves. Can one find analogous phenomena in the noncommuting theory, compare the two, and thereby set some experimental limits on the noncommutativity?

The previously mentioned difficulty is now evident: Waves are local excitations, but no meaning can be attached to local quantities in the noncommuting theory because they are gauge variant. On the other hand, gauge-invariant noncommuting quantities involve integration over space-time, but we would lose detailed physical information about Maxwell waves if their profiles are integrated.

Here the Seiberg-Witten map suggests a solution. Working to $O(\theta)$, we express the noncommuting fields in terms of commuting ones:

$$\hat{A}_\mu = A_\mu - \frac{1}{2} \theta^{\alpha\beta} A_\alpha (\partial_\beta A_\mu - F_{\beta\mu}) \quad (28a)$$

$$\hat{F}_{\mu\nu} = F_{\mu\nu} + \theta^{\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\mu} F_{\beta\nu} - \theta^{\alpha\beta} A_\alpha \partial_\beta F_{\mu\nu} \quad (28b)$$

where $F_{\mu\nu}$ is the Abelian field strength, the curl of A_μ . These profiles satisfy the condition (27) with

$$G(A, \lambda) = \lambda - \theta^{\alpha\beta} A_\alpha \partial_\beta \lambda . \quad (29)$$

Also (28a) solves to $O(\theta)$ a differential equation

that can be derived from (27):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \hat{A}_\mu}{\partial \theta^{\alpha\beta}} = & -\frac{1}{8}\{\hat{A}_\alpha, \partial_\beta \hat{A}_\mu - \hat{F}_{\beta\mu}\}_+ \\ & + \frac{1}{8}\{\hat{A}_\beta, \partial_\alpha \hat{A}_\mu - \hat{F}_{\alpha\mu}\}_+ . \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Note however that when $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$ is larger than (2×2) , (30) entails a *set* of equations, but they are not integrable. This means that when one constructs $\hat{A}_\mu(\theta \neq 0)$ from $\hat{A}_\mu(\theta = 0) = A_\mu$, the construction depends on the path in θ -space. We shall return to this point.

The commutative action, which emerges when (28b) is inserted in the noncommuting Maxwell action, reads [11]

$$\begin{aligned} I = \int d^4x \Big(& -\frac{1}{4}F^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu} \\ & + \frac{1}{8}\theta^{\alpha\beta}F_{\alpha\beta}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\theta^{\alpha\beta}F_{\mu\alpha}F_{\nu\beta}F^{\mu\nu} \Big) . \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

The “Maxwell” equations are

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\mathbf{B} + \nabla \times \mathbf{E} = 0 \quad (32a)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0 . \quad (32b)$$

These are not dynamical; they merely express the fact that electric and magnetic fields ($E^i = F^{i0}$, $B^i = -\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{ijk}F_{jk}$) are given in terms of potentials. The remaining equations, which follow from (31), can be given a Maxwell form

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\mathbf{D} - \nabla \times \mathbf{H} = 0 \quad (33a)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{D} = 0 . \quad (33b)$$

with constituent relations following from (31):

$$\mathbf{D} = (1 - \boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{B})\mathbf{E} + (\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{E})\mathbf{B} + (\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B})\boldsymbol{\theta} \quad (34a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H} = & (1 - \boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{B})\mathbf{B} \\ & + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{E}^2 - \mathbf{B}^2)\boldsymbol{\theta} - (\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{E})\mathbf{E} . \end{aligned} \quad (34b)$$

Here we have assumed that $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$ has no temporal component: $\theta^{0\alpha} = 0$, $\theta^{ij} = \varepsilon^{ijk}\theta^k$.

It turns out that [to $O(\theta)$] the nonlinear equations (32)–(34) still possess plane wave solutions. However, in the presence of a background

magnetic field $\mathbf{b}$ the dispersion law between frequency ω and wave number $\mathbf{k}$ is modified from the Maxwell result $\omega = k$; we find

$$\omega = k(1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_T \cdot \mathbf{b}_T) \quad (35)$$

where the subscript “ T ” denotes components transverse to the direction of propagation $\mathbf{k}$.

Evidently, Lorentz symmetry is violated: the velocity of light has changed, increasing or decreasing over the Maxwell value. In principle this should lead to a fringe shift in a Michaelson-Morley-type experiment. However, with present limits on $\theta \leq (10 \text{ TeV})^{-2}$ (obtained from studies of interaction with matter [12]), visible light (wavelength $\sim 10^{-5} \text{ cm}$) and attainable magnetic fields ($\sim 1 \text{ tesla}$) would lead to the shift of 1 fringe on an optical length of 1 parsec (10^{18} cm). Obviously more advanced technology is required to render feasible this test of noncommutativity!

Note that both polarizations undergo the same velocity change. This is in contrast to a previous model for violating Lorentz symmetry in electrodynamics, wherein a spatial Chern-Simons was added to the Maxwell action [13]. In this modification the theory remains linear; eqs. (33) involve $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ [i.e., the constituent relations (34) take on their $\theta = 0$ value] but the right side of (33a) acquires a term proportional to $\mathbf{B}$. The net result is that plane waves with different polarizations travel with different velocities, producing a Faraday-type rotation, which can be ruled out experimentally [13,14].

Although a Faraday rotation does not occur in the noncommutative generalization of Maxwell theory, (31), the following is noteworthy. Observe that the modification in (31) involves two numbers (1/8 and 1/2). Since θ may be rescaled, only their ratio (4) matters. One can check that when the ratio departs from this particular value, plane waves still solve the equations, but now the two polarizations travel at different velocities. So noncommutativity is the unique modification to Maxwell theory [within the class (31)] that avoids a Faraday rotation.

A final comment: It has been observed that the action (31) may be viewed as a Maxwell action in a background gravitational field, which itself is constructed from $F_{\mu\nu}$. Moreover, the equa-

tions (32)–(34) coincide with the geodetic equation in that gravitational field [15]. This hints at a view that noncommutativity reflects the presence of a “medium”, and this theme will reappear in an explicit realization of the Seiberg-Witten map within fluid mechanics.

V The next investigation I shall describe results in an explicit formula for the Seiberg-Witten map. The derivation again makes use of the fluid analogy, but now we need the second, alternative formulation of fluid mechanics, the so-called Euler formulation. This is not a comoving description (like the Lagrange formulation), rather the experimenter observes the fluid density ρ and velocity $\mathbf{v}$ at a given point in space-time $(t, \mathbf{r})$.

In preparation for our derivation, I shall briefly outline the Euler point of view. Moreover, later I shall rely on that outline to give a generalization of Eulerian fluid mechanics to the case when a non-Abelian symmetry group acts on the various degrees of freedom (components) of the fluid.

A point particle in space-time is described by its space-time coordinate $X^\mu(\tau)$, which depends on an evolution variable τ that parameterizes the path. One expects that X^μ satisfies some dynamical equation, which determines $\ddot{X}^\mu$, but rather than concentrating on that equation (this would correspond to a Lagrange description) we focus on the density and current associated with that particle. These are functions of $x^\mu \equiv (t, \mathbf{r})$ and are related to X^μ by the formulas

$$\rho(t, \mathbf{r}) = \int d\tau \dot{X}^0(\tau) \delta^4(X^\mu(\tau) - x^\mu) \quad (36a)$$

$$= \int d\tau \dot{X}^0(\tau) \delta(X^0(\tau) - t) \delta^3(\mathbf{X}(\tau) - \mathbf{r})$$

$$\mathbf{j}(t, \mathbf{r}) = \int d\tau \dot{\mathbf{X}}(\tau) \delta^4(X^\mu(\tau) - x^\mu) \quad (36b)$$

$$= \int d\tau \dot{\mathbf{X}}(\tau) \delta(X^0(\tau) - t) \delta^3(\mathbf{X}(\tau) - \mathbf{r})$$

We can choose the parameterization so that $X^0(\tau) = \tau$, whereupon (36) becomes

$$\rho(t, \mathbf{r}) = \delta^3(\mathbf{X}(t) - \mathbf{r}) \quad (37a)$$

$$\mathbf{j}(t, \mathbf{r}) = \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t) \delta^3(\mathbf{X}(t) - \mathbf{r}) . \quad (37b)$$

Observe that either from the definition (36) or from (37) a continuity equation for $(\rho, \mathbf{j})$ follows identically:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho(t, \mathbf{r}) + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}(t, \mathbf{r}) = 0 . \quad (38)$$

Note also that (37b) defines the velocity $\mathbf{v}$ as a function of $(t, \mathbf{r})$: it is $\dot{\mathbf{X}}(t)$ with $\mathbf{X}(t)$ replaced by $\mathbf{r}$: $\mathbf{j} = \rho \mathbf{v}$.

A second equation is obtained by differentiating (37b) with respect to time:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{j} &= \rho \dot{\mathbf{v}} + \dot{\rho} \mathbf{v} = \rho \dot{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{v} \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) \\ &= \dot{\mathbf{X}} \dot{X}^j \frac{\partial}{\partial X^j} \delta^3(\mathbf{X}(t) - \mathbf{r}) + \text{force} . \end{aligned} \quad (39a)$$

Here “force” denotes a formula for $\ddot{\mathbf{X}}$, which specifies the dynamics that govern particle motion. The next to last term may be rewritten as

$$-\dot{\mathbf{X}} \dot{X}^j \frac{\partial}{\partial r^j} \delta^3(\mathbf{X}(t) - \mathbf{r}) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial r^j} (\mathbf{v} v^j \rho) .$$

Thus putting everything together we find

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{\rho} \text{force} . \quad (39b)$$

Eqs. (38) and (39b) are the Eulerian equations for a “fluid” composed of a single particle! When there are several particles, labeled by index n , formulas (37) are replaced by

$$\rho(t, \mathbf{r}) = \sum_n \delta^3(\mathbf{X}_n(t) - \mathbf{r}) \quad (40a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{j}(t, \mathbf{r}) &= \rho(t, \mathbf{r}) \mathbf{v}(t, \mathbf{r}) \\ &= \sum_n \dot{\mathbf{X}}_n(t) \delta^3(\mathbf{X}_n(t) - \mathbf{r}) \end{aligned} \quad (40b)$$

but the subsequent development is as before, culminating in (38) and (39b). Finally, for a fluid, the discrete label becomes a continuous parameter specifying the fluid $n \rightarrow \mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{X}_n(t) \rightarrow \mathbf{X}(t, \mathbf{x})$; the density and velocity expressions are the continuum generalizations of (40)

$$\rho(t, \mathbf{r}) = \int d^3x \delta^3(\mathbf{X}(t, \mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{r}) \quad (41a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{j}(t, \mathbf{r}) &= \rho(t, \mathbf{r}) \mathbf{v}(t, \mathbf{r}) \\ &= \int d^3x \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t, \mathbf{x}) \delta^3(\mathbf{X}(t, \mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{r}) \end{aligned} \quad (41b)$$

and once again the continuity (38) and Euler (39b) equations are established.

It is useful to understand in detail the content of (41), which expresses the relation between the Lagrange variables $[\mathbf{X}(t)]$ and the Euler variables $[\rho(t, \mathbf{r}), \mathbf{v}(t, \mathbf{r})]$. Evidently the integration over the parameter $\mathbf{x}$ evaluates the delta function at a value of $\mathbf{x} = \boldsymbol{\chi}(t, \mathbf{r})$ such that

$$\mathbf{X}(t, \boldsymbol{\chi}) = \mathbf{r} \quad (42)$$

and also there is a Jacobian. Thus (41a) also states that

$$\frac{1}{\rho(t, \mathbf{r})} = \det \frac{\partial X^i(t, \mathbf{x})}{\partial x^j} \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=\boldsymbol{\chi}} \quad (43)$$

while (41b) implies

$$\mathbf{v}(t, \mathbf{r}) = \dot{X}^i(t, \mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=\boldsymbol{\chi}}. \quad (44)$$

Effectively the passage from Lagrange to Euler descriptions involves interchanging the dependent variable $\mathbf{X}$ with the independent parameter $\mathbf{x}$, which is renamed $\mathbf{r}$ with the help of $\boldsymbol{\chi}(t, \mathbf{r})$.

Finally we note that the theory is completed by giving a model for the force. This will include the (negative) gradient of the pressure, frequently taken as a function of ρ . If the fluid is charged, we are dealing with magnetohydrodynamics: $1/\rho$ force includes the Lorentz force: $\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}$, and $j^\mu = (\rho, \rho \mathbf{v})$ is the source for the electromagnetic fields in Maxwell's equations

$$\partial_\mu F^{\mu\nu} = j^\nu. \quad (45)$$

Later I shall describe how this is generalized when an internal symmetry is present, and a group index a labels various physical quantities.

Both a configuration space Lagrangian/action formulation and a canonical Hamiltonian formulation for equations (38), (39b) with pressure and Lorentz forces, and (45) can be given [5].

VI Let me now turn to the task of obtaining an explicit formula for the Seiberg-Witten map from the fluid analogy. Actually, I shall present the inverse map, expressing commuting fields in terms of noncommuting ones; also the derivation

will be restricted to the case of two spatial dimensions [where θ^{ij} involves a single quantity and there are *no* integrability conditions on the differential equation (30)]. Higher dimensional cases have been treated as well; the development is more complicated. A few remarks about them will be given later; for a complete discussion I refer you to the published literature [4].

The (inverse) Seiberg-Witten map, for the case of two spatial dimensions, can be extracted from (41), which we rewrite as

$$j^\mu(t, \mathbf{r}) = \int d^2x \frac{\partial}{\partial t} X^\mu(t, \mathbf{x}) \delta^2(\mathbf{X}(t, \mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{r}) \quad [\dot{X}^0 = 1]. \quad (46)$$

Observe that the right side of (46) depends on $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ through $\mathbf{X}$ [see (16)]. It is easy to check that the integral (46) is invariant under the transformations (13); equivalently viewed as a function of $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$, it is gauge invariant [see (17)]. Owing to the conservation of j^μ , $\partial_\mu j^\mu = 0$ [see (38)], its dual $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu} j^\mu$ satisfies a conventional, commuting Bianchi identity, and therefore can be written as the curl of an Abelian vector potential A_α , apart from proportionality and additive constants:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\alpha A_\beta - \partial_\beta A_\alpha + \text{constant} \\ \propto \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu} \int d^2x \frac{\partial}{\partial t} X^\mu \delta^2(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{r}) \\ \partial_i A_j - \partial_j A_i + \text{constant} \\ \propto \varepsilon_{ij} \int d^2x \delta^2(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{r}) = \varepsilon_{ij} \rho. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

This is the (inverse) Seiberg-Witten map, relating the $\mathbf{A}$ to $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$.

Thus far the operator properties and the non-commutativity have not been taken into account. To do so, first we reinterpret the integral over $\mathbf{x}$ as a trace over the Hilbert space that realizes the noncommutativity of the coordinates (this is a standard procedure); second we must provide an ordering for the δ -function depending on the operator $X^i = x^i + \theta^{ij} \hat{A}_j$. This we do with the Weyl prescription by Fourier transforming. The final operator version of equation (47), restricted to the two-dimensional spatial components, reads

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^2r e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} (\partial_i a_j - \partial_j a_i) \\ = -\varepsilon^{ij} \left[\int d^2x e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{X}} - (2\pi)^2 \delta(\mathbf{k}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Here the additive and proportionality constants are determined by requiring agreement for weak noncommuting fields.

Formula (48) has previously appeared in a direct analysis of the Seiberg-Witten relation [16]. Now we recognize it as the (quantized) expression relating Lagrange and Euler formulations for fluid mechanics [4].

In higher-dimensional cases, greater than 2, there arises the need to define a generalized current tensor, whose dual gives rise to a two-index tensor satisfying a Bianchi identity (closed and exact 2-form). There is some ambiguity in the construction when quantum mechanical ordering needs to be implemented. The ambiguity precisely parallels the ambiguity in “integrating” the path-dependent Seiberg-Witten differential equation; see Ref. [4].

VII A natural question that comes at this stage is whether one can extend the fluids–noncommuting fields analogy to include a non-Abelian symmetry group. This has not been achieved thus far, but for a first step we need to construct non-Abelian fluid mechanics. This has been done. I shall now present the theory, which arises very naturally from non-Abelian point-particle mechanics, just in the same way as I presented earlier a derivation of an (Eulerian) fluid from point-particle mechanics [17].

Clearly, a non-Abelian fluid will possess a current J_a^μ that carries an internal symmetry index a . In the presence of dynamical gauge fields (non-Abelian magnetohydrodynamics) J_a^μ serves as source for these fields in a generalization of (45),

$$(D_\mu F^{\mu\nu})_a = J_a^\nu \quad (49)$$

and is covariantly conserved, for consistency with (49)

$$(D_\mu J^\mu)_a = 0. \quad (50)$$

Here D_μ is the covariant derivative $(D_\mu)^{ac} = \partial_\mu \delta^{ac} + f^{abc} A_\mu^b$, where the non-Abelian gauge potential A_μ^a is contracted with the structure constants f^{abc} of the non-Abelian group. The challenge for us is to discover how the non-Abelian current determines a charge density and velocity, and what kind of Euler equations are satisfied by these quantities.

To discover this, we recall the dynamics of a non-Abelian point particle, as described by Wong [18]. The particle carries a coordinate $\mathbf{X}(t)$ and a non-Abelian charge $q_a(t)$. The charge and current densities read [compare (37)]

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_a(t, \mathbf{r}) &= q_a(t) \delta^3(\mathbf{X}(t) - \mathbf{r}) \\ \mathbf{j}_a(t, \mathbf{r}) &= q_a(t) \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t) \delta^3(\mathbf{X}(t) - \mathbf{r}). \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Covariant conservation is assured because the charge $q_a(t)$ is assumed to obey the Wong equation

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q}_a(t) + f^{abc} \dot{X}^\mu(t) A_\mu^b(t, \mathbf{X}(t)) q^c(t) &= 0 \\ [\dot{X}^0 = 1]. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Moreover, particle acceleration is determined by the equation satisfied by $\mathbf{X}(t)$, e.g.,

$$\dot{P}_\mu = q_a F_{\mu\nu}^a \dot{X}^\nu \quad (53)$$

where P_μ is the particle 4-momentum. A Lagrangian/action and a Hamiltonian canonical formulation of these equations can be given; it involves the Kirilov-Kostant 1-form on the Lie algebra [19].

The passage to a fluid is now clear. First we consider a finite number of particles, and introduce a particle label n : X_n^μ, P_n^μ, q_a^n . Next we pass to the continuum $n \rightarrow \mathbf{x}$: $X^\mu(t, \mathbf{x}), P_\mu(t, \mathbf{x}), q_a(t, \mathbf{x})$ – these are the Lagrange variables. The non-Abelian charge and current densities are defined as in (41)

$$\rho_a(t, \mathbf{r}) = \int d^3x q_a(t, \mathbf{x}) \delta^3(\mathbf{X}(t, \mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{r}) \quad (54a)$$

$$\mathbf{j}_a(t, \mathbf{r}) = \quad (54b)$$

$$\int d^3x q_a(t, \mathbf{x}) \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t, \mathbf{x}) \delta^3(\mathbf{X}(t, \mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{r}).$$

This remains covariantly conserved provided the Lagrangian non-Abelian charge variable $q_a(t, \mathbf{x})$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} q_a(t, \mathbf{x}) \\ + f_{abc} \dot{X}^\mu(t, \mathbf{x}) A_\mu^b(t, \mathbf{X}(t, \mathbf{x})) q^c(t, \mathbf{x}) = 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

The important feature of these formulas is that by virtue of the δ -function they factorize into an Abelian current and a non-Abelian charge factor

$$\rho_a(t, \mathbf{r}) = Q_a(t, \mathbf{r}) \rho(t, \mathbf{r}) \quad (56a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{j}_a(t, \mathbf{r}) &= Q_a(t, \mathbf{r}) \mathbf{j}(t, \mathbf{r}) \\ &= Q_a(t, \mathbf{r}) \rho(t, \mathbf{r}) \mathbf{v}(t, \mathbf{r}) \end{aligned} \quad (56b)$$

with Q_a being the Eulerian charge, related to the Lagrange charge by

$$Q_a(t, \mathbf{r}) = q_a(t, \mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{X}(t, \mathbf{r})} \quad (57)$$

[see (42)–(44)]. Moreover, the Abelian current is still given by (41), so it satisfies the Abelian continuity equation, and $\mathbf{v}$ satisfies an Euler equation that reflects the underlying particle dynamics. Finally, the Eulerian charge (56) obeys the fluid Wong equation that follows from (55) and (57) or alternatively from (56) when it is remembered that $j_a^\mu = Q_a j^\mu$ and j^μ are respectively conserved covariantly and ordinarily:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} Q_a + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla Q_a = f_{abc} Q^b (A_0^c - \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{A}^c) . \quad (58)$$

Non-Abelian magnetohydrodynamics then is described by the field equations (49), (50), by the factorization (56), by the fluid Wong equation (58), and by the Euler equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} = q^a \mathbf{E}_a + \mathbf{v} \times q^a \mathbf{B}_a + \frac{1}{\rho} \text{force} \quad (59)$$

where we have explicitly exhibited the contribution to the force term of the non-Abelian Lorentz force, involving the non-Abelian electric $\mathbf{E}_a$ and magnetic $\mathbf{B}_a$ fields. A Lagrangian for these equations makes use of a field-theoretic generalization of the Kirilov-Kostant 1-form [17].

In the above approach a single density and velocity describe all the group components, i.e., ρ and $\mathbf{v}$ are “ a ”-independent. It is possible to give a more elaborate treatment where different ρ and $\mathbf{v}$ are associated with different elements of the Cartan subalgebra of the group. Thus for $\text{SU}(2)$, with one Cartan element, there would still be only a single density and velocity describing all three group degrees of freedom. On the other hand, for $\text{SU}(3)$ the more refined treatment uses two distinct densities and velocities. For this elaboration I refer you to the literature [17].

Our approach to fluid was motivated by an underlying particle picture, as in the passage from (37) to (41). There is also a field-based approach, which is illustrated by the fluid interpretation of the Schrödinger equation, due to Madelung [20]. Observe that the Schrödinger equation for a particle in an electromagnetic field derived from potentials $(\varphi, \mathbf{A})$ reads

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \nabla - e\mathbf{A} \right)^2 \Psi + e\varphi \Psi . \quad (60)$$

If we define $\Psi = \rho^{1/2} e^{i\theta/\hbar}$, then the real and imaginary parts of (60) become

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho + \nabla \cdot ((\nabla \theta - e\mathbf{A}) \rho) = 0 \quad (61a)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \theta + \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \theta - e\mathbf{A})^2 = -e\varphi + \hbar^2 M \quad (61b)$$

$$M \equiv \frac{1}{4} \frac{\nabla \rho}{\rho} - \frac{1}{8} \frac{(\nabla \rho)^2}{\rho^2} . \quad (61c)$$

The first of these suggests identifying $\nabla \theta - e\mathbf{A}$ as the velocity, so that the continuity equation (38) is regained. Then upon taking the gradient of the second equation, we arrive at

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} = e(\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}) + \frac{1}{\rho} \text{force} \quad (62)$$

where “force” is the so-called Madelung $O(\hbar^2)$ quantum force given by $\rho \nabla M$. Thus we see that Eulerian fluid mechanics emerges within this reanalysis of Schrödinger theory.

One may therefore assay a field-based non-Abelian fluid mechanics by beginning with a Schrödinger theory for a multicomponent wave

function transforming under some non-Abelian group. What emerges is a fluid mechanics that is much more complicated than the particle-based model that we presented above. The crucial difference is that here there is no simple factorization of the current, nor does a Wong equation hold [17,21].

It is unclear at present which (if any) of these non-Abelian generalizations for fluid mechanics will prove to be the most useful.

REFERENCES

1. H. Snyder, “Quantized Space-Time”, *Phys. Rev.* **71**, 38 (1947). This story has been told and documented by J. Wess, private communication.
2. A modern account is in G. Dunne, R. Jackiw, and L. Trugenberger, “Topological (Chern-Simons) Quantum Mechanics”, *Phys. Rev. D* **41**, 661 (1990); G. Dunne and R. Jackiw, “‘Peierls Substitution’ and Chern-Simons Quantum Mechanics”, *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)* **33C**, 114 (1993).
3. G. Magro, “Noncommuting Coordinates in the Landau Problem”, MIT Senior Thesis, quant-ph/0302001.
4. R. Jackiw, S.-Y. Pi, and A. Polychronakos, “Noncommuting Gauge Fields as a Lagrange Fluid”, *Ann. Phys. (NY)* **301**, 157 (2002).
5. See, for example, R. Jackiw, *Lectures on Fluid Mechanics* (Springer, Berlin 2002).
6. R. Jackiw, “Gauge Covariant Conformal Transformations”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **41**, 1635 (1978); “Invariance, Symmetry, and Periodicity in Gauge Theories”, *Acta Phys. Austr. Suppl.* **XXII**, 383 (1980), reprinted in R. Jackiw, *Diverse Topics in Theoretical and Mathematical Physics* (World Scientific, Singapore 1995).
7. R. Jackiw and S.-Y. Pi, “Covariant Coordinate Transformations on Noncommutative Space”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 1116031 (2002).
8. N. Seiberg and E. Witten, “String Theory and Noncommutative Geometry”, *JHEP* **9909**, 032 (1999).
9. R. Jackiw and S.-Y. Pi, “Noncommutative 1-cocycle in the Seiberg-Witten map”, *Phys. Lett.* **B534**, 181 (2002).
10. Z. Guralnik, R. Jackiw, S.-Y. Pi, and A. Polychronakos, “Testing Noncommutative QED, Constructing Noncommutative QCD”, *Phys. Lett.* **B517**, 450 (2001); R.-G. Cai, “Superluminal Noncommutative Photons”, *Phys. Lett.* **B517**, 457 (2001).
11. A. Bichl, J. Grimstrup, L. Popp, M. Schweda, and R. Wulkenhaar, “Perturbation Analysis of the Seiberg-Witten Map”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A17**, 2219 (2002).
12. S. Carroll, J. Harvey, V. Kostelicky, C. Lane, and T. Okamoto, “Noncommutative Field Theory and Lorentz Violation”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 141601 (2001).
13. S. Carroll, G. Field, and R. Jackiw, “Limits on a Lorentz and Parity Violating Modification of Electrodynamics”, *Phys. Rev. D* **41**, 1231 (1990).
14. S. Carroll and G. Field, “Is There Evidence for Cosmic Anisotropy in the Polarization of Distant Radio Sources?”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2394 (1997).
15. V. Rivelles, “Noncommutative Field Theories and Gravity”, *Phys. Lett.* **B558**, 191 (2003).
16. Y. Okawa and H. Ooguri, “Exact Solution to the Seiberg-Witten Equation of Noncommutative Gauge Theory”, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 040009 (2001).
17. B. Bistrovic, R. Jackiw, H. Li, V.P. Nair, and S.-Y. Pi, “Non-Abelian Fluid Dynamics in Lagrangian Formulation”, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 025013 (2003).
18. S. Wong, “Field and Particle Equations for the Classical Yang-Mills Field and Particles with Isotopic Spin”, *Nuovo Cimento A* **65**, 689 (1970).
19. D. Bak, R. Jackiw, and S.-Y. Pi, “Non-Abelian Chern-Simons Particles and Their Quantization”, *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 6778 (1994) (Appendix).
20. E. Madelung, “Quantentheorie in hydrodynamischer Form”, *Z. Phys.* **40**, 322 (1927).
21. D. Bohm, R. Schiller, and J. Tiomno, “A Causal Interpretation of the Pauli Equation”, *Nuovo Cimento, Suppl.* **1**, 48 (1955); P. Love and B. Boghosian, “Quaternionic Origin for the Madelung Potential”, gr-qc/0211065.